

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CINITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ON NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/764,110	01/19/2001		Paul A. Puniello	20002.0015	8132	
23517	7590	09/08/2004		EXAMINER		
SWIDLER 3000 K STR		HEREFF FRIED	LEE, EDMUND H			
BOX IP	,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTON, DC 20007				1732		

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	γk
		09/764,110	PUNIELLO ET AL.	•
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		EDMUND H. LEE	1732	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reper population of the provision of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statution reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH le, cause the application to become ABAN	ly be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this communication NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.
Status			•	
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 J	lune 2004.		
		s action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matters	s, prosecution as to the merit	s is
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 31-42 is/are pending in the application	on.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) 31-42 is/are rejected.			
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		,
Applicati	ion Papers			€ 2
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•	` '
11) 🗌 🤄	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached O	Office Action or form PTO-152	<u>'</u>
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		19(a)-(d) or (f).	
	1. Certified copies of the priority document			
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	• •		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	·	ceived in this National Stage	
* S	application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` '/'	ceived	
·	the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rec	serveu.	
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) \square Interview Sum	nmary (PTO-413)	
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/M	//ail Date	
3) 🔲 Inforn Paper	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Datent and Tr		-,		

Art Unit: 1732

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puniello (USPN 6129881) in view of Dickson et al (USPN 2361348). In regard to claim 31, Puniello teaches the basic claimed process including a method of molding a golf ball (col 7, lns 22-47; figs 6-9c); providing a core (col 7, lns 22-47; figs 6-9c); providing a first and second mold plate that join to define at least one internal molding cavity for molding a golf ball layer (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); providing a first retractable pin in the first mold plate, wherein the pin comprises a free end for contacting the core and wherein the pin comprises two projections formed on its free end (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); placing the core between the pins so that the core is centered within the cavity (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); disposing the material in eth cavity until the material covers the core and forms a layer (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); and solidifying the material of the layer such that the projections on the pin form corresponding depressions in the layer (col 7, lns 22-47; figs 6-9c). It should be mentioned that Puniello does teach using at least two retractable sleeves to support the core (col 5, Ins 5-6). Puniello, however, does not teach a plurality of retractable pins in a first mold plate. Dickson et al teach a

Application/Control Number: 09/764,110

Art Unit: 1732

method of molding a golf layer upon a core (figs 1-10); using retractable pins at various positions within a mold plate, e.g., pins at the poles or pins around the core figs 1-10); and using pins whose tips forms depressions on the molded layer (figs 1-10). Puniello and Dickson et al are combinable because they are analogous with respect to using retractable pins to mold a golf ball layer upon a core. Even though Puniello teaches the preferential use of a pin at each pole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a retractable pin sleeve of Puniello at each pin location taught by Dickson et al (fig 6) in order to provide lateral and axial support to the core of Puniello during molding. In regard to claims 32 and 34, such are taught by Puniello (col 7, lns 22-47 and figs 6-9c). In regard to claim 35, such is taught by the above combined teachings of Puniello and Dickson et al. In regard to claims 33 and 36, Puniello does not teach using a core having at least one layer; and producing a cover having the claimed limitations of claim 36. In regard to using a core having at least one layer, such is a mere obvious matter of choice dependent on the desired final product and of little patentable consequence since it is not a manipulative feature or step of the claimed process. Further, multi-layered cores are well-known in the golf ball art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a multi-layered core in the process of Puniello in order to produce a golf ball having enhanced performance characteristics. In regard to producing a cover having the claimed limitations of claim 36, such is a mere obvious matter of choice dependent on the desired final product and of little patentable consequence to the claimed process since it is not a manipulative feature or step of the

Application/Control Number: 09/764,110

Art Unit: 1732

claimed process. Further, golf ball covers having the claimed limitations are well-known in the golf ball art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to produce a cover having the claimed limitations by the process of Puniello in order to provide a golf ball having enhanced performance characteristics.

3. Claims 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puniello (USPN 6129881) in view of Dickson et al (USPN 2361348). In regard to claim 37, Puniello teaches the basic claimed process including a method of molding a golf ball (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); providing a core (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); providing a first and second mold plate that join to define at least one internal molding cavity for molding a golf ball layer (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); providing a first vent pin in the first mold plate, wherein the pin comprises a free end for contacting the core and wherein the pin comprises two projections formed on its free end (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); placing the core between the pins so that the core is centered within the cavity (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c); disposing the material in the cavity until the material covers the core and forms a layer (col 7, lns 22-47; figs 6-9c); and solidifying the material of the layer such that the projections on the pin form corresponding depressions in the layer (col 7, Ins 22-47; figs 6-9c). It should be mentioned that Puniello does teach using at least two retractable/vent sleeves to support the core (col 5, Ins 5-6). Puniello, however, does not teach a plurality of vent pins in a first mold plate. Dickson et al teach a method of molding a golf layer upon a core (figs 1-10); using retractable pins at various positions within a mold plate, e.g., pins at the poles or pins around the core figs

Art Unit: 1732

1-10); and using pins whose tips forms depressions on the molded layer (figs 1-10). Puniello and Dickson et al are combinable because they are analogous with respect to using retractable pins to mold a golf ball layer upon a core. Even though Puniello teaches the preferential use of a pin at each pole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a retractable/vent pin sleeve of Puniello at each pin location taught by Dickson et al (fig 6) in order to provide lateral and axial support to the core of Puniello and more venting during molding. In regard to claims 38 and 40, such are taught by Puniello (col 7, lns 22-47 and figs 6-9c). In regard to claim 41, such is taught by the above combined teachings of Puniello and Dickson et al. In regard to claims 39 and 42, Puniello does not teach using a core having at least one layer; and producing a cover having the claimed limitations of claim 42. In regard to using a core having at least one layer, such is a mere obvious matter of choice dependent on the desired final product and of little patentable consequence since it is not a manipulative feature or step of the claimed process. Further, multilayered cores are well-known in the golf ball art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a multi-layered core in the process of Puniello in order to produce a golf ball having enhanced performance characteristics. In regard to producing a cover having the claimed limitations of claim 42, such is a mere obvious matter of choice dependent on the desired final product and of little patentable consequence to the claimed process since it is not a manipulative feature or step of the claimed process. Further, golf ball covers having the claimed limitations are well-known in the golf ball art. Thus, it would have

Art Unit: 1732

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to produce a cover having the claimed limitations by the process of Puniello in order to provide a golf ball having enhanced performance characteristics.

- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 31-42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Giza (USPN 4959000) teaches using retractable pins at positions around the core as opposed to at the poles.

Application/Control Number: 09/764,110

Art Unit: 1732

Page 7

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDMUND H. LEE whose telephone number is 571.272.1204. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY FROM 9AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on 571.272.1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDMUND H. LEE Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732

EHL

7 du 9/7/04